

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Leave me alone: solitary females attract more mates in a nocturnal insect

Lehtonen, Topi Kasper

2020-08

Lehtonen , T K & Kaitala , A L 2020 , ' Leave me alone: solitary females attract more mates in a nocturnal insect ' , Behavioral Ecology , vol. 31 , no. 4 , pp. 1040-1045 . <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/araa049>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/330118>

<https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/araa049>

unspecified

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Leave me alone: solitary females attract more mates in a nocturnal insect

Short title: Lone females attract more males

Topi K. Lehtonen^{1,2} & Arja Kaitala^{1,2}

¹ Department of Ecology and Genetics, University of Oulu, Post Box 3000, 90014 Oulu, Finland

² Tvärminne Zoological Station, University of Helsinki, J.A. Palménin tie 260, 10900 Hanko, Finland

Correspondence: topi.lehtonen@oulu.fi

Abstract

Spatial distributions of sexual competitors and potential mating partners have a large impact on sexual selection and mating systems. Typically, such effects are investigated with regard to male aggregations. However, females may also need to compete for mating opportunities. Here we investigated consequences of clustering and rival attractiveness on female mate attraction success under field conditions in a nocturnal beetle, the common glow-worm, *Lampyrus noctiluca*. We placed dummy females of two glow intensity (attractiveness) levels either alone or in clusters of varying attractiveness compositions. We found that by displaying alone rather than in a cluster, females have a higher probability of mating and greater potential to exercise mate choice. Within clusters, females of both attractiveness levels had the highest probability of mating when having neighbours of only the less attractive type. These results show that both the presence and attractiveness of rivals can strongly influence females' mate attraction. The findings also suggest that the typical distribution of glowing females in the wild is better explained by female than male benefits. Hence, the results highlight the important links between spatial distribution of females, male mate searching and sexual selection.

Keywords: aggregation, bioluminescence, female competition, neighbour effect, sex role, sexual selection

INTRODUCTION

Spatial clustering of both potential mates and sexual competitors is a key factor in the distribution of mating success within populations. In particular, spacing of individuals impacts both the tactics for mate searching (and sampling) and the intensity of interactions between rivals (Emlen and Oring 1977; Ims 1988; Andersson 1994). In this respect, the consequences of spatial distribution of sexual signallers may differ depending on their attractiveness. For example, some empirical studies suggest that when mates are located farther apart (or otherwise in a lower density), their mating success is distributed more evenly, which may benefit less ornamented sexual signallers (Palokangas et al. 1992; Shelly and Bailey 1992; Berglund 1995; Kokko and Rankin 2006; Dougherty and Shuker 2015). However, under a different set of circumstances, less attractive individuals may benefit from forming a cluster (see Adams and Morse 2014; van Wijk et al. 2017) for example due to attraction of potential mates by a cluster being more important than attractiveness of individuals within the cluster. In males, mating success benefits from clustering may result in impressive lek aggregations (Beehler and Foster 1988; Gibson et al. 1990).

Within a cluster, an individual's success may also depend on the attractiveness of its neighbours. For example, comparatively unattractive individuals might benefit from close associations with more attractive signallers due to an increased number of visits by members of the opposite sex (Beehler and Foster 1988; Partecke et al. 2002), which also increases the potential of weaker signallers to "steal" matings from attractive rivals (Gross 1996). An alternative hypothesis asserts that by associating with comparatively unattractive rivals, an individual might benefit by increasing its relative attractiveness to prospective mates (Bateson and Healy 2005). For instance, larger fiddler crab, *Uca*

45 *mjoebergi*, males may increase their mating success if managing to associate with
46 smaller neighbours (Callander et al. 2011).

47 To date, our understanding of the consequences of clustering or neighbour attractiveness
48 on the distribution of matings has largely been based on lekking species, in which large
49 clusters of males gather together. In contrast, less is known about the role of clusters
50 and signalling neighbourhoods in species that do not form leks and especially when
51 females compete with other females for mate attraction. Such situations may arise
52 especially when reproducing using only stored resources, i.e. in capital breeders
53 (Houston et al. 2007). Due to the finite resources being traded-off between different
54 aspects of reproduction, capital breeding females may pay particularly high fecundity or
55 other fitness costs from prolonged sexual signalling or self-maintenance. Indeed, mating
56 quickly can increase their expected number of offspring (in Lampyridae: Wing 1989;
57 Hopkins 2018) and they may therefore need to actively attract mates and even compete
58 for matings, independent of whether their fitness increases with the number of matings.
59 Hence, capital breeding can result in increased variation in female reproductive success
60 and strong sexual selection on female traits related to mate attraction.

61 We assessed the roles of clustering and signalling neighbourhoods in mate attraction in
62 females of a nocturnal, capital breeding beetle, the common glow-worm, *Lampyrus*
63 *noctiluca*. In particular, we used dummy females in the field to assess the competing
64 hypotheses of benefits from clustering (as in leks: Beehler and Foster 1988; Gibson et
65 al. 1990) and the proximity of rivals impacting female mating success negatively (male
66 examples: Arak et al. 1990; Wong et al. 2018). In addition, we tested how attractiveness
67 of rivals affects the probability of attracting a mate and the potential for exercising mate
68 choice. We expected opportunities for mate choice to be highest for solitary females and

females with less attractive rivals. Finally, we hypothesised that if male body size correlates with competitiveness (as in many species: Hunt et al. 2009), smaller males may be more likely to target female clusters or less attractive females within such clusters.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study site and model species

The study was conducted in the vicinity of Tvärminne Zoological Station, southern Finland (59°50.7' N; 23°15.0' E), during the glow-worm breeding season (June - early July) in 2019.

The common glow-worm is a nocturnal beetle species in which flightless females emit a continuous greenish glow during calm summer nights to attract flying, non-glowing males. Females that have a larger body size emit, on average, a brighter glow and are also more fecund (Hopkins et al. 2015). A brighter glow, in turn, is expected to be more efficient in attracting males (Hopkins et al. 2015). This is particularly relevant because adult glow-worms do not eat (i.e. are capital breeders) and therefore need to use resources gathered during the larval stage for reproduction. Any delays in mating decrease female fecundity and are therefore likely to be highly costly to the female reproductive success (Hopkins 2018). In other words, it should be advantageous for a female to mate as soon as possible. While multiple males sometimes arrive within a short period of time, and a majority of females succeed in attracting a mate during their first or second night of displaying, considerably longer mating lags are not rare and mating delays up to three weeks have been documented (Dreisig 1971; Tyler 2002;

Hickmott & Tyler 2011; personal observations). The female ceases to glow very soon after succeeding to mate, typically with a single male, then lays her eggs and dies soon after (Dreisig 1971; Tyler 2002; personal observations). Field observations suggest that the successful male tends to guard the female until the morning (Tyler 2002; personal observations), but it may potentially mate again at least during oncoming nights. Glowing females are aggregated within good signalling habitats and areas, whereas within such areas, their spatial distribution does not seem to be similarly aggregated. In the local population, the distance between adjacent females was found to be an average 4 metres, >1 metre in 79% of the assessed cases, and ≤ 0.50 metres in slightly over 10% of the cases (Borshagovski et al. 2019). The realised distances between signalling females may be affected by e.g. the population size, behavioural interactions among females, suitable spots for mate attraction, and egg-laying opportunities within the habitat.

Study design

We tested female attractiveness with respect to different signalling neighbourhood compositions in the field using dummy females that trapped males landing to mate. The dummy females were constructed by slightly modifying the methods of Hopkins et al. (2015). Briefly, each dummy female consisted of a plastic funnel trap (volume: ~1 litre) that had a green 5 mm light emitting diode (LED) mounted on the top and in the centre of the funnel's mouth (Figure 1a). The peak emission wavelength of the LED was ~560 nm, mimicking the glow of a live female common glow-worm (Tyler 2002; De Cock 2004), and it was powered by two standard AA dry batteries (Figure 1a). We constructed dummy females of two brightness and hence expected attractiveness (Hopkins et al. 2015) levels. The glow intensity of the brighter female type (hereon: "B") was controlled by wiring the LED with one 1000 ohm resistor (resulting in the

peak glow intensity of $\sim 0.13 \mu\text{W}/\text{nm}$). Each dummy female of the dimmer type (hereon: "D") had its LED wired with four 1000 ohm resistors (peak glow intensity: $\sim 0.02 \mu\text{W}/\text{nm}$). Such a difference in relative brightness is easily visible to a human observer and reflects the range seen among wild females in the local population (personal observations).

Each dummy female was placed either on its own (B: $n = 30$; D: $n = 30$) or in a cluster of four dummy females that were placed in the formation of a quadrat with 50 cm sides (Figure 1b; $n = 57$ clusters that included 228 dummy females). To assess the effects of different competitive neighbourhoods, we ran replicates with all possible combinations of B and D dummy females. This allowed our female level analysis (see below for details) to have the following four neighbourhood categories: no neighbours ($n = 60$), all neighbours of the B type ($n = 56$), all neighbours of the D type ($n = 56$) and both neighbour types present ($n = 116$; Figure 1).

There was no direct line of sight between any adjacent replicates and the minimum distance between them was 100 metres. Each replicate lasted one night, and we ran ~ 1 replicate of each replicate type (range: 0 - 2) simultaneously, with the locations of replicates relative to each other having been randomised using a random number generator. The female dummies were set at 23:00 - 24:00 hours and then left out to attract males for 130 - 180 minutes (depending on the night), which covered the entire nightly glowing period of wild females and mate searching period of males at the research site (personal observations). The surroundings of each replicate were checked once or twice during the night to ensure that no other females were glowing in close proximity. After a replicate was completed, the number of males trapped by the dummy female was counted and, as a proxy of body size, the dorsal exoskeletal plate

(pronotum) width of each male was later measured in the laboratory using a calliper.

The males were then marked and released back to the wild.

The above data were used, as follows, to assess how clustering and competitive neighbourhood affect females' probability of mate attraction (during their first night of signalling), their potential to be choosy, and phenotypes (body sizes) of the attracted males.

Probability of attracting a mate

We used R 3.3.2 software (R Development Core Team) for all statistical analyses. First, we ran a generalised mixed models ('lme4' package) with a binomial distribution to assess whether or not a dummy female had managed to attract at least 1 male, i.e. using the presence of at least one trapped male (possible values: 0 / 1) as the response variable. Dummy brightness (B / D) and neighbourhood category (solitary / all B neighbours / all D neighbours / B and D neighbours present) were assigned as fixed effects and "replicate ID" was added as a random effect to account for the non-independence of dummy females within a replicate. We then proceeded with refitting the model using χ^2 - tests (as per Crawley 2007). In this regard, if the interaction was found to be non-significant, the main effects were assessed from a model fitted without it.

Potential to be choosy

As a proxy of a (dummy) female's opportunity to be choosy, we used the number of attracted males. This assessment was conducted among the subset of dummy females that had attracted at least 1 male. Here we assumed a Poisson distribution ('lme4' package) as appropriate for count data that is not overdispersed (assessed as per Zuur et

al. (2013)). We then applied the same fixed effects, a random effect, and refitting procedure as described in the previous section.

Male size

With regard to male body size, we were interested in whether female clustering or brightness affects the body size of attracted males. For example, if multiple males arrive at the same time, small males might have higher chances of success when targeting less attractive females or clusters of females (rather than solitary ones). Overall, the female dummies captured 389 males. Of these, pronotum width data are missing for 9 individuals, 6 were recaptures from replicates run during previous nights and another 4 had been captured earlier (and then marked and released) in an unrelated experiment conducted near the research station. All available data points were included in the data analyses and the exclusion of the recaptures does not change the conclusions. We applied a linear mixed effects model ('nlme' package) with male pronotum width as the response variable and in other respects used the same variables and general approach as described above.

RESULTS

Probability of attracting a mate

Overall, 47% (135 out of 288) of the dummy females, whether alone or in a cluster, attracted at least 1 male. The interaction between female brightness and neighbourhood type did not have a significant effect (mixed model, model comparison: $\chi^2 = 1.692$, $df = 3$, $P = 0.64$). A dummy female was more likely to attract a male when it was brighter (mixed model, $\chi^2 = 13.11$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$; Figure 2a). The neighbourhood also had a

significant effect on the probability of attracting a mate (mixed model, overall neighbour effect: $\chi^2 = 15.50$, $df = 3$, $P = 0.0014$). In particular, mate attraction probability was the highest for solitary females (solitary: 63% versus combined probability for clusters: 43%, implying a significant difference at $\alpha = 0.01$), with the probability being significantly lower in other neighbourhood types except for the one with only D (dimmer) neighbours (Figure 2*b*, Table 1*a*). Within clusters, mating probability was therefore the highest when the focal dummy female had only D neighbours (Figure 2*b*, Table 1*a*) and it was the lowest when both types of neighbours were present (Figure 2*b*, Table 1*a*).

Potential to be choosy

Regarding female dummies that attracted at least one male, the interaction effect between brightness and neighbourhood category on the number of attracted males was not significant (mixed model, model comparison, $\chi^2 = 3.084$, $df = 3$, $P = 0.38$). As with the probability to mate, B dummy females attracted higher numbers of males than D ones (mixed model, $\chi^2 = 7.763$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.0053$; Figure 3*a*). In addition, neighbourhood had a significant effect on the number of attracted males (mixed model, $\chi^2 = 32.33$, $df = 3$, $P < 0.001$; Figure 3*a*), with solitary females attracting a higher number of males than any of the clustered neighbourhood types (Figure 3*b*, Table 1*b*) and the different clustered neighbourhoods not significantly differing from each other (Figure 3*b*, Table 1*b*). It is worth noting that the number of males attracted by clusters of four with at least one successful dummy female (5.0 ± 0.6 [mean \pm SE], $n = 44$ clusters) was not significantly different from the number of males attracted by solitary female dummies attracting at least one male (4.4 ± 0.6 , $n = 38$) (Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 902$, $P = 0.54$). This conclusion remains the same if all dummies (i.e. also non-successful ones) are included.

Male size

Body size of the attracted males did not significantly differ regarding any of the assessed variables (Linear mixed model, all $P > 0.10$).

DISCUSSION

We found that, in accordance with the prior expectation (Hopkins et al. 2015), brighter dummy females were more likely to attract males than dimmer ones. This effect was independent of the neighbourhood types. Notably, independent of female brightness (attractiveness), a higher percentage of solitary than clustered females attracted a mate, with solitary females also attracting higher total numbers of males. The results also show that when females are in clusters, their neighbourhood is important: female success in attracting at least one mate was the highest when the neighbourhood only consisted of females of the dimmer (D) category and it was the lowest when the neighbourhood consisted of a mixture of both female types (B and D).

Some previous studies have suggested that males of non-lekking species should advertise relatively far apart from their rivals. For instance in bushcrickets, *Tettigonia viridissima*, males were less successful in attracting females when clustered than when regularly spaced within an experimental arena (Arak et al. 1990). In the European tree frog, *Hyla arborea*, the ability of mate sampling females to discriminate male acoustic signals improved with increased separation of the speakers producing the male call (Richardson and Lengagne 2010). These species, however, employ acoustic sexual signals, which may be more prone to signal interference than species that rely mostly on visual signals. Our results show that the benefit of physical distance from rivals does

apply also when females compete with other females for mating opportunities using a visual signal. In particular, a larger proportion of glow-worm female dummies attracted a male when alone than when in a cluster, with this effect being similar for females of both brightness (attractiveness) levels. Among the females that succeeded in attracting a male, solitary females attracted larger numbers of males than clustered females. Indeed, the numbers of males attracted by four clustered female dummies together were not significantly higher than those attracted by solitary female dummies, implying that the benefits of solitary mate attraction are high in this system. We note the possibility that if the local male density is exceptionally high, males might arrive in short enough succession (before the female glow signal has faded) to sexually harass solitary females especially.

In many systems, female reproductive success does not significantly increase with the number of matings (e.g. Parker 2006). This is also likely to be the typical case in capital breeders such as glow-worms, which nevertheless are likely to benefit from mating quickly: mating delays can reduce their fecundity (Wing 1989; Hopkins 2018). The result that solitary females mate quicker also helps to explain why females in the wild are not more commonly clustered in smaller spatial scales. From the male perspective, our results imply that a solitary female is more likely to attract rival males, inducing a higher probability of failure to mate after finding a female due to male-male competition. After mating, the glow-worm male usually guards the female (Tyler 2002; personal observations), but a cluster of females might nonetheless provide the male more opportunities to compare females or to mate with additional females later. If some males are indeed able to remate later without getting markedly sperm depleted, for females, the difference between signalling alone versus in a cluster may be smaller than our results suggest. However, the scope for males to remate, at least during the same

night, seems to be limited in this system (Tyler 2002; personal observations). Therefore, our results indicate that the system is female rather than male driven: females benefit from signalling separately, whereas males should benefit from arriving at clusters of signalling females.

In the competitive situation within a cluster, differences in individuals' mate attraction abilities may be important. We found evidence for the cost of having neighbours being the lowest (i.e. mating probability being the highest) when all neighbours were of the lower attractiveness (brightness) category. By showing that the neighbourhood does affect attractiveness of an individual, the results suggest that an active choice of the social environment may pay off (see Laland et al. 1999; Ryder et al. 2009). Previous studies have found, for instance, that less attractive male house finches, *Carpodacus mexicanus*, can improve their pairing success by changing to a new social group (Oh and Badyaev 2010). Glow-worm females, in turn, have been found to move away from a particularly bright (dummy) rival (Borshagovski et al. 2019). Females of glow-worms and other capital breeding species may also face a trade-off between mating as quickly as possible (to optimise fecundity) and exercising mate choice, with larger (and hence likely brighter) females being in a better position to pay the costs of any mating delays (Hopkins 2018). In the current study, a neighbourhood consisting of both bright and dim rivals was the least favourable. Such a pattern could be due to, for example, a heterogeneous female cluster being less detectable or attractive to males, providing an interesting avenue for future research. Furthermore, clusters of four consisting solely of bright (B) females attracted more males than clusters with only dim (D) females, which increases the observed success of females in the "B neighbours only" category and decreases the detected benefit of having only D neighbours.

We cannot rule out a completely passive mate attraction (Arak 1988) taking place in this system, with males simply mating with the first female they happen to detect. Such a mating pattern may result in an overall advantage for B females and within groups an advantage to females that have only D neighbours. Neither is the scenario in direct odds with our finding that a greater brightness did not always ensure an advantage, with D females attracting some (albeit on average a lower number of) males even when in the same cluster with one or multiple B rivals. Regardless of whether males exert active or passive mate choice, our results suggest that selection favours females that glow alone rather than in groups and within a group females should be better off signalling in the absence of any attractive neighbours.

To conclude, in this study we have shown that by displaying alone rather than in clusters, females, independent of their attractiveness, have a higher probability of mating quickly and have a greater potential to be choosy. The results also show that within clusters, the most favourable neighbourhood may be the one that exclusively has neighbours of lower level of attractiveness. Hence, the results strengthen our understanding of the relationships between spatial distribution, sexual competition and mating success, showing their importance even when females compete with other females.

Funding

The work was supported by the Academy of Finland [grant number 294664 to AK].

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Anna-Maria Borshagovski, Christina Elgert, Juhani Hopkins, Timo Piepponen and Otso Valkeeniemi for their help with the fieldwork preparations, to Natarsha Babic and Timo Piepponen for assistance with data gathering, Ulrika Candolin, Juhani Hopkins and anonymous reviewers for insightful comments on earlier versions of the text, Maria-Elena Bernal for checking the grammar, and the staff of Tvärminne Zoological Station for logistic support.

Data Accessibility: Analyses reported in this article can be reproduced using the data provided by Lehtonen and Kaitala (2020).

REFERENCES

Adams SA, Morse DH. 2014. Condition-dependent mate choice of a parasitoid wasp in the field. *Anim Behav.* 88:225–232.

Andersson M. 1994. Sexual selection. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Arak A. 1988. Female mate selection in the natterjack toad: active choice or passive attraction? *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* 22:317–327.

Arak A, Eiriksson T, Radesäter T. 1990. The adaptive significance of acoustic spacing in male bushcrickets *Tettigonia viridissima*: a perturbation experiment. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* 26:1–7.

Bateson M, Healy SD. 2005. Comparative evaluation and its implications for mate choice. *Trends Ecol Evol.* 20:659–664.

- 328 Beehler BM, Foster MS. 1988. Hotshots, hotspots, and female preference in the
329 organization of lek mating systems. *Am Nat.* 131:203–219.
- 330 Berglund A. 1995. Many mates make male pipefish choosy. *Behaviour.* 132:213–218.
- 331 Borshagovski A-M, Baudry G, Hopkins J, Kaitala A. 2019. Pale by comparison:
332 competitive interactions between signaling female glow-worms. *Behav Ecol.* 30:20–26.
- 333 Callander S, Jennions MD, Backwell PRY. 2011. Female choice over short and long
334 distances: neighbour effects. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* 65:2071–2078.
- 335 Crawley MJ. 2007. *The R Book*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- 336 De Cock R. 2004. Larval and adult emission spectra of bioluminescence in three
337 European firefly species. *Photochem Photobiol.* 79:339–342.
- 338 Dougherty LR, Shuker DM. 2015. The effect of experimental design on the
339 measurement of mate choice: a meta-analysis. *Behav Ecol.* 26:311–319.
- 340 Dreisig H. 1971. Control of the glowing of *Lampyris noctiluca* in the field (Coleoptera:
341 Lampridae). *J Zool.* 165:229–244.
- 342 Emlen ST, Oring LW. 1977. Ecology, sexual selection, and the evolution of mating
343 systems. *Science.* 197:215–223.
- 344 Gross MR. 1996. Alternative reproductive strategies and tactics: diversity within sexes.
345 *Trends Ecol Evol.* 11:92–98.

346 Hickmott W, Tyler J. 2011. Seasonal variation in the female display period of the glow-
 347 worm *Lampyris noctiluca* L. Lampyrid. 1:14–21.

348 Hopkins J. 2018. The costs and consequences of female sexual signals. (PhD Thesis)
 349 Oulu, Finland: University of Oulu.

350 Hopkins JP, Baudry G, Candolin U, Kaitala A. 2015. I’m sexy and I glow it: Female
 351 ornamentation in a nocturnal capital breeder. Biol Lett. 11:8–11.

352 Houston AI, Stephens PA, Boyd IL, Harding KC, Mcnamara JM. 2007. Capital or
 353 income breeding ? A theoretical model of female reproductive strategies. Behav Ecol.
 354 18:241–250.

355 Hunt J, Breuker CJ, Sadowski JA, Moore AJ. 2009. Male–male competition, female
 356 mate choice and their interaction: determining total sexual selection. J Evol Biol. 22:13–
 357 26.

358 Ims RA. 1988. The potential for sexual selection: effect of sex ratio and spatiotemporal
 359 distribution of receptive females. Evol Ecol. 2:338–352.

360 Kokko H, Rankin DJ. 2006. Lonely hearts or sex in the city? Density-dependent effects
 361 in mating systems. Phil Trans R Soc B. 361:319–334.

362 Laland KN, Odling-Smee FJ, Feldman MW. 1999. Evolutionary consequences of niche
 363 construction and their implications for ecology. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 96:10242–
 364 10247.

365 Lehtonen TK, Kaitala A. 2020. Leave me alone: solitary females attract more mates in a
 366 nocturnal insect. Dryad, Dataset, <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.bg79cnp7v>

367 Oh KP, Badyaev AV. 2010. Structure of social networks in a passerine bird:
 368 consequences for sexual selection and the evolution of mating strategies. Am. Nat.
 369 176:E80–E89.

370 Palokangas P, Alatalo RV, Korpimäki E. 1992. Female choice in the kestrel under
 371 different availability of mating options. Anim Behav. 43:659–665.

372 Parker GA. 2006. Sexual conflict over mating and fertilization: an overview. Phil Trans
 373 R Soc B. 361:235–259

374 Partecke J, von Haeseler A, Wikelski M. 2002. Territory establishment in lekking
 375 marine iguanas, *Amblyrhynchus cristatus*: support for the hotshot mechanism. Behav
 376 Ecol Sociobiol. 51:579–587.

377 Richardson C, Lengagne T. 2010. Multiple signals and male spacing affect female
 378 preference at cocktail parties in treefrogs. Proc R Soc B. 277:1247–1252.

379 Ryder TB, Parker PG, Blake JG, Loiselle BA. 2009. It takes two to tango: reproductive
 380 skew and social correlates of male mating success in a lek-breeding bird. Proc R Soc B.
 381 276:2377–2384.

382 Shelly TE, Bailey WJ. 1992. Experimental manipulation of mate choice by male
 383 katydids: the effect of female encounter rate. Behav Ecol Sociobiol. 30:277–282.

384 Tyler J. 2002. The glow-worm. Kent, UK: Lakeside Printing Ltd.

- 385 van Wijk M, Heath J, Lievers R, Schal C, Groot AT. 2017. Proximity of signallers can
386 maintain sexual signal variation under stabilizing selection. *Sci Rep.* 7:18101.
- 387 Wing SR. 1989. Energetic costs of mating in a flightless female firefly, *Photinus*
388 *collustrans* (Coleoptera: Lampyridae). *J Insect Behav.* 2:841–847.
- 389 Wong BBM, Lehtonen TK, Lindström. 2018. Spatial and temporal patterns of nest
390 distribution influence sexual selection in a marine fish. *Oikos.* 127:1104–1112.
- 391 Zuur AF, Hilbe JM & Ieno EN. 2013. A beginner's guide to GLM and GLMM with R:
392 A frequentist and Bayesian perspective for ecologists. Newburgh, UK: Highland
393 Statistics.

394 **Tables**

395 Table 1. Pair-wise differences between neighbourhood types. B and D refer to the two
 396 brightness levels. In both panels, (a) and (b), the upper right part gives z values
 397 (provided by a mixed model described in the methods) and the lower left part gives the
 398 matching P values

		Solitary	Only B	Only D	Both B and D
(a) Mating probability	Solitary		2.243	0.442	3.262
	Only B	<i>0.025</i>		1.665	0.734
	Only D	0.66	0.096		2.576
	Both B and D	<i>0.0011</i>	0.46	<i>0.010</i>	
		Solitary	Only B	Only D	Both B and D
(b) Number of males	Solitary		3.638	3.672	5.929
	Only B	<i><0.001</i>		0.197	1.397
	Only D	<i><0.001</i>	0.84		1.756
	Both B and D	<i><0.001</i>	0.16	0.079	

Figure legends

Figure 1

(a) A female dummy, i.e. a funnel trap equipped with a green LED on top, as a schematic presentation (left panel) and as seen during night time from above (right panel). (b) Dummy females were placed either in clusters of four or singly. (c) Within a cluster, the neighbours were either all of the brighter type (darker orbs, left cluster) all dim (paler orbs, right cluster) or a mix of the two neighbour types (lower middle cluster). In these examples, the focal dummy female, denoted with a dashed ring, was of the brighter type

Figure 2

The percentage of dummy females that attracted at least 1 male with regard to (a) brightness and (b) neighbourhood categories. In (b), columns without a letter in common are significantly different (mixed model, $\alpha = 0.05$; Table 1a), and the clustered neighbourhood categories are coloured. The error bars show 95% confidence intervals. Sample size are given above each column

Figure 3

The number of males attracted by those female dummies that attracted at least 1 male, with regard to (a) female dummy brightness and (b) neighbourhood categories (those without a letter in common are significantly different; mixed model, $\alpha = 0.05$, Table 1b). Sample size are given above each column